

Master Tennessee Index - MTI
RFI # 317.03-145
Clarifications/Questions

Responses to Written Comments – February 27, 2006

#	Question	Response
	Note: in the questions that follow, any vendor's restatement of the text of the TRUST Request for Proposals (RFP) is for reference purposes only and shall not be construed to change the original RFP wording.	
1	Please provide more explanation on the Record Location Services (RLS) as mentioned on page 2, A.5.	The RLS is software that does not store extended data attributes centrally; it simply identifies the location of records wherever they are stored.
2	Please provide more information/detail on Hierarchy Management as mentioned on page 4, bullet 2	Hierarchy Management (custom hierarchies, external hierarchies) will allow you to manage different or multiple state hierarchies such as the different systems, groups, departments, users, etc that reside in the state.
3	RFI section B.1.1 makes reference to the ongoing implementation of an Integrated Criminal Justice Portal. Presumably the Portal project uses ESB software today to access DMV, DOC and TBI databases. Is the State looking at the MPI as an additional data source that can be queried via the ICJ Portal? If yes, does the State prefer that the vendor use the same ESB architecture to support the generation and maintenance of the MPI? If not, what is the relationship between the AOC portal and this MTI initiative?	The existing Integrated Criminal Justice Portal does not use an Enterprise Service Bus (BUS). The State of Tennessee is not currently using an ESB, but understands that a tool like this will be necessary for a Master Person Index. The State would like the portal to query the MTI first for a person, and then provide links to extended data from the various criminal justice systems.
4	RFI section B.1.2 discusses the longer term view for MTI and implies that other State Agencies would access the MPI thru some means other than the ICJ Portal. It would seem that Goal 5 and a RLS service would support the idea of an independent query capability not tied to DMV, TBI or DOC.	That is correct. The MTI will provide person information for any State Agency Information System that could use the data. The MTI must provide an application API or a custom designed query must be designed through a product such as an ESB.
5	RFI section A, Goals 3 and 7 describe various analytical capabilities envisioned as part of the overall MTI solution. Could the State expand upon these goals? Is the State looking for either portal (web-based) analytical tools or more sophisticated desktop tools that can interact with MPI data?	Goal 3 refers to the overall goal for the State of Tennessee to use a combination of Enterprise Service Bus and Master Person Index software to support the sharing of data. Goal 7 refers to the data cleansing that will need to take place when moving data into the MTI. A master person index should be capable of cleansing this data before matching person identities.
6	Once the RFI responses have been received, what is the review and decision making process?	There RFI will be a guide to help the State of Tennessee compose a Request For Proposal (RFP). The RFI will be simply an informational tool for the State to educate themselves of this technology in order to design a well constructed RFP.
7	What are the decision criteria for selecting the vendor/solution of choice?	That has not been defined yet. The decision criteria will be designed when the RFP is constructed.
8	What is the process for allocating funding for the initiative?	This project will go through the States project approval process.

Master Tennessee Index - MTI
RFI # 317.03-145
Clarifications/Questions

Responses to Written Comments – February 27, 2006

#	Question	Response
9	When will vendors asked to submit pricing parameters?	The Vendors will be asked to submit pricing parameter when the RFP is posted.
10	What is the purchase timeline?	The purchase timeline will most likely happen towards the end of 2006 or early 2007.
11	In section B.1.1, you describe an "Integrated Criminal Justice Web Portal".) Does this portal (or some portion of it) already exist?	The portal already exists and has been constructed without the use of a Master Person Index or ESB.
12	In section B.1.1, you describe an "Integrated Criminal Justice Web Portal".) If it does exist, will it be utilized as the front end "portal"?	The State's Portal Vendor will most likely be used as the front end portal, but that decision has not been made yet.
13	In section B.1.1, you describe an "Integrated Criminal Justice Web Portal".) What toolset/environment (i.e.; Java, Visual Basic, etc.) has been used to develop the front end portal?	That decision has not been made yet, but the state's standards are J2EE and Microsoft.Net.
14	Does the State of TN have a development platform of choice?	The States development platform standards are both J2EE and Microsoft.Net.
15	Please list the systems that will be participating in (supplying data to) the "Integrated Criminal Justice Web Portal"... Please list each candidate system.	This is answered in sections B.1.1 of the RFI.
16	Can each system natively be queried to provide the requested information to the Portal (i.e.; Does each system provides a standard set of APIs)?	These systems do not have APIs and will need to be natively queried. Future MTI systems may or may not have APIs available.
17	Are the source systems "green screen" or "windows based" systems?	There are both green screen and windows based systems as well as Unix.
18	How many records exist within each of the source systems?	Each system could have between, 100,000 to 500,000 records.
19	Is the "Integrated Criminal Justice Web Portal" query only?	Yes